


THE *Dan Smoot Report*



DAN SMOOT

Vol. 11, No. 39 (Broadcast 527) September 27, 1965 Dallas, Texas

COMMUNIZING AMERICA

In an article entitled "How We Are Being Communized," published by *American Opinion*, Martin Dies (original chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities) says:

"We are now spilling precious American blood and expending billions of dollars . . . on acts which we are told will contain Communism abroad. Is it not time for us to ask ourselves: 'Are we containing Communism at home?' "(1)

Presenting a mass of impressive facts and figures to prove his point, Mr. Dies concludes that not "even Karl Marx could . . . expect more progress in his recommended program of gradual Communization," than is now being made in the United States. Here are extracts from Mr. Dies' article:

"My dictionary defines *communism* as: 'A social system that puts property, capital and industry under the control of the community.' It is obvious that such control can be achieved by ownership of the title of the means of production, or by control of them . . .

"The federal government now owns a third of the . . . land in the United States . . . Washington has also vastly increased its share of all civilian holdings and structures. In 1900 . . . public holdings comprised 6.8 percent of the values of all structures in the country; by 1958, this ownership had grown to twenty-one percent . . .

"We have considered federal ownership, but we must discuss federal control which, in many instances, is equivalent to ownership. Since 1933, the U.S. Government has spent \$36 billion for price support of farm commodities. Accompanying this aid . . . have been hundreds of rules and regulations establishing federal control . . .

"While the small farmers were being obliterated, the small businessmen were suffering the same fate as a result of expanding federal control and competition from government-operated businesses and government-labor blackmail . . . The Wagner Act [1935] established the National Labor Relations Board . . . and changed the balance of power between labor and management to an imbalance heavily in favor of organized labor . . .

"There were also the vast federal corporation taxes, and the reciprocal trade treaties which . . .

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, a magazine published every week by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., mailing address P. O. Box 9538, Lakewood Station, Dallas, Texas 75214; Telephone TAYlor 1-2303 (office address 6441 Gaston Avenue). Subscription rates: \$10.00 a year, \$6.00 for 6 months, \$18.00 for two years. For first class mail \$12.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14.50 a year. Reprints of specific issues: 1 copy for 25¢; 6 for \$1.00; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10.00—each price for bulk mailing to one person. Add 2% sales tax on all orders originating in Texas for Texas delivery.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1965. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.
No Reproductions Permitted.

made it impossible for some businesses and industries in America to compete with lower-cost un-unionized labor abroad.

"To gauge the effect of all these controls upon American business, one need only read the statistics of commercial and industrial failures in the past ten years; they have averaged about fourteen thousand per year. This is only a drop in the bucket compared with the thousands of independent businesses which have voluntarily quit or which have been sold to some national chain company in disgust.

"What will be the effect of the disappearance of small farmers, businessmen, and industrialists in the United States? The first speech I made in Congress was on this subject. I quoted from the leading Socialist writer of that period who said that the multitude of small businesses and industries had to be eliminated before Socialism could win the United States. He said that when farming and industry were concentrated in large corporations, and a few individuals, it would be an easy matter to convert the economy from free enterprise to Socialism, but that this would not be possible as long as the multitude of independent businessmen and industrialists stood in the path of Socialism

"In the *Communist Manifesto*, Karl Marx advocated 'Centralization of credit in the hands of the state' Can anyone deny that credit is now largely centralized in . . . agencies of the federal government? . . .

"Marx . . . recommended 'Centralization of the means of communication . . . in the hands of the state.' The federal government now fully controls the air waves through the Federal Communications Commission, and political considerations have become dominant in the administration of the laws regulating the use of air waves by the television and radio industries. All that one need do is listen to a . . . broadcast to discover the influence of the Administration in power upon the views expressed and the slanting of the news. Commentators, reporters, and columnists who do not play ball with the Administration in power are the victims of devastating discrimination

"Marx . . . advocated the centralization . . . of transportation in the hands of the state. Today the federal government is spending billions of dollars to subsidize transport Hand in hand with these subsidies are ever-tightening controls of the transport companies

"Karl Marx, in the first plank of his program, advocated 'Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.' This is being accomplished steadily. In every section of our nation, land is being taken for government lakes, parks, forests, power projects, reserves, and the like The federal government now owns one-third of the nation's total real estate

"The second plank in Marx's platform, 'A heavy progressive or graduated income tax,' has already been accomplished in the United States.

"In his third proposal, Marx advocated 'Abolition of all rights of inheritance.' This has not yet been fully accomplished in America, but considerable progress in this direction has been made. All that anyone needs to do is read the tax rates of our federal government and our states on the estates of decedents to discover that, in the case of many estates, the tax amounts to virtual confiscation

"In his seventh plank, Marx advocated 'Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State.' . . . The value of factories and instruments of production owned by the federal government accounts for a considerable part of the 328 billion dollars of property now owned by the federal government.

"The eighth plank in Marx's program for Communization of countries by degrees advocates 'equal liability of all to labor' [and] 'establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.' This will be the last plank which will be adopted in the United States, but its adoption will become inevitable when the other proposals are written into law. Already, we have had our C. C. C., and our Job Corps, and more such proposals are on the way.

"In the *Manifesto*, Karl Marx said, 'But communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religions, and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience.' This provides us with the most important yardstick to measure the degree of Communization of our country. Ask yourself: Are religion and morality being abolished in the United States? . . .

"The sad truth is that the moral fiber and ethical standards of our people and their public servants have been seriously weakened A minister of Christ holds a party for homosexuals and is praised for doing it by his fellow clergy-

men. Billy Sol Estes, the President's friend, defrauds hundreds of millions and gets away with it on a weird technicality. Bobby Baker, another friend of the President, uses government to make himself a millionaire—and laughs at efforts to hold him to account. Walter Jenkins, a Presidential Assistant, meets sick old men in restrooms for homosexual activity and winds up the heart-throb of 'Liberals' everywhere for having been 'overworked.' Prayer is stopped in schools Morality is no longer revered and many reverends are no longer moral, and America is sick with the rot of it, and Karl Marx has achieved another goal for Communizing our land.

"More than one hundred years ago Marx and Engels published the *Communist Manifesto*. It is the Bible of Communists and Socialists, and the yardstick by which nations can measure their descent into the abyss of Communism. Any truthful consideration of the record and facts should convince anyone but the ignorant, the brainwashed, or the blind that the United States is moving towards Communism according to the timetable of the International Communist Conspiracy."⁽¹⁾

However, Martin Dies states:

"I do not say, nor do I mean to intimate, that Communists have planned and directed the policies of our government—even though about five thousand Communists were discovered on the federal payroll as a result of the investigations conducted by the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities I do say, however, that if the Communists had planned and directed America's turn to the Left, they could not have done a better job of carrying out the advice of Karl Marx to Communize the United States by degrees."⁽¹⁾

I first became aware of communism in 1943 when, as an FBI agent, I was assigned to investigate communist activities in northern Ohio. I noticed that communists were entertained in the White House and that some in government were promoted *after* the FBI had submitted reports on their communist activities. I observed, on the other hand, that patriots like Martin Dies, who spoke out strongly and plainly *against* communism were bludgeoned with public slander.⁽²⁾ Some of the bitterest vilification of anti-communists came from liberals who professed hatred of communism. I

was bewildered by all of this, until I understood it.

Roosevelt liberals in 1943—like Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson liberals later—were sensitive to any fundamental criticism of communism, because the liberalism which has dominated intellectual and political life in America since 1933 has the same goal as the announced goal of communism: the establishment of socialism.

Whereas the Founding Fathers who created our constitutional system in 1787 distrusted government and feared political power, modern liberals worship government and strive to give it unlimited power to do anything which government officials claim to be good.

The Founding Fathers were confronted with a dilemma. They knew that an inexorable law of human nature causes men to abuse political power. They knew that all governments will, if permitted, waste the substance of the people and ultimately enslave the people, always under pretense of helping the people. Thomas Jefferson summed up their attitude when, in essence, he said: In questions of political power, do not talk about confidence in men, or trust anyone with political power: just bind all government officials down from mischief with the chains of a Constitution so that they cannot harm the people.

Yet, it was impractical to write a Constitution listing in detail *all* powers which government should have for all times and all occasions. At any given moment in history, it may be unnecessary, and dangerous, for a government agency to engage in activity which may become, at a later time, a proper and needed function of government. In a complex and growing society, some governmental power must be flexible, broad, and general.

If such flexible power were left with state governments, it could be, and would be, abused by state officials; but if the states were bound together in a union, so that their citizens had common citizenship in a national system, there would be some restraining and corrective force. If a state government abused its power, it would lose good,

productive citizens and private organizations to other states. Experience and competition among the states would eventually force correction of the worst evils flowing from abuse of power by state officials.

If the federal government were given flexible powers to use at the discretion of federal officials, the federal government would inevitably become a dictatorship: a political and economic colossus usurping powers and revenue of the states under pretext of giving them aid; robbing and enslaving the people, under the pretext of taking care of them. There would be no competitive force (as among the states) to restrain or correct the tyranny and follies of the federal government, because they would be imposed on the whole nation, arbitrarily; and there would be no way for citizens to escape.

Our Founding Fathers solved the complex problem by writing a binding contract of government—the Constitution—rigidly limiting the federal government to powers granted in the contract, leaving all flexible, general powers of government to the states.

This was the political system which left the American people so free from harassment by government and, thus, released so much human energy and ingenuity, that Americans quickly converted their portion of the backward, underdeveloped North American continent into the most powerful and prosperous nation in history.

Yet, by 1943, American liberals had rejected the system and were branding its advocates crackpots and trouble makers. By 1961, the Attorney General of the United States (Robert F. Kennedy) was considering a recommendation, made by one of the nation's foremost socialists (Walter Reuther), that advocates of the old constitutional system be formally branded "radical right-wing extremists" and placed on the Attorney General's list of subversives.⁽⁸⁾

America's totalitarian liberals do not, for the most part, admit to being socialists, because the American public still thinks it is opposed to so-

cialism. For years, socialists openly participated in American elections, but received only token support at the polls. Eventually convinced that Americans would not *wittingly* adopt socialism, the socialists changed tactics. They infiltrated the major political parties and presented their old ideas under deceptive new labels. Instead of demanding a centralized government with absolute power to confiscate and redistribute the wealth of the people, they clamored for "government with a heart," "government with power to act in the interests of the whole people," "industrial democracy," "social reform," a "welfare state."

Change in slogans and language made no change in ultimate goal: the aim of socialists is a central government with absolute power to confiscate from the people whatever officials say they need for promoting the general welfare.

Modern American liberals, who generally deny being socialists and claim to hate both communism and fascism, want the same kind of political system that socialists, communists, and fascists want: a totalitarian state which directs and controls the people for purposes which officials allege to be good for the people.

Though socialism, communism and fascism have always had the same objective, there has been bitter enmity among socialists, communists, and fascists. Part of the enmity resulted from rivalry for power—rivalry as elemental, as easy to understand, as the rivalry among three dogs fighting for the same bone. Yet, part of the enmity among the three major branches of socialism arose from differences in methods used to accomplish the common objective.

Historically, socialists believed that a majority of people could be persuaded to vote for the establishment of socialism by legislative process; but socialists were not honest in their claim of wanting to institute socialism in the United States by *legal* means. If they had been honest, they would have started by advocating amendment of the Constitution, through *legal* constitutional process, to give the federal government absolute power to do anything the President and a majority of both Houses

of Congress want to do. As our Constitution stands, the federal government does not have enough power to institute socialist programs *legally*, even if the entire population should want the programs. Constitutional prohibitions against an all-powerful socialist government are ignored, however; and socialists are credited with wanting to institute socialism by *legal* means.

Historically, communists believed that socialism must be instituted by *illegal* means. Asserting that the people are controlled by the propaganda, wealth, and entrenched power of capitalists, Karl Marx believed that the people could never be led to institute socialism by legal, legislative process. Therefore, communists traditionally advocate seizure of power, through violent means, by a small elite of communists who will then govern as a dictatorship of the proletariat until the last remnants of private capitalism are eliminated, and until the people have been trained to live and work in a pure socialist society. Then the dictatorship will be dissolved and people will live and work under the benevolent controls of society.

The original marxian fear of capitalist resistance to the establishment of socialism made communism an international movement. Marx believed that even if a communist elite could seize power in one nation and institute a socialist dictatorship, capitalists of other nations would combine to make war on the socialist state and destroy it. Marx was convinced, therefore, that socialism would not be safe until all nations of the world were under one socialist dictatorship. This is why communists are dedicated to a program of *world* conquest.

Fascists also believed that the people could never be openly persuaded to approve institution of the totalitarian socialist state; but the fascist method of conquest was less direct than the communist method which Marx prescribed. Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy created what can best be described as "corporate states." Ownership of major business, financial, commercial, and industrial organizations was left in private hands; but government imposed such controls over the organizations that they became mere branches of gov-

ernment. The net result was the same as in communist nations: total government control of all major means of production.

Whereas Karl Marx believed that wealthy capitalists would fight to the death to preserve their own way of life, the fascists knew better. They learned early what Lenin discovered, and what most communists in later years have found out, that wealthy businessmen often lack the sense or courage to fight for their own. The fascists in Germany and Italy acquired power with the eager assistance of wealthy businessmen who later became helpless tools of the power they had financed.

Fascist contempt for capitalists resulted in another basic difference between the over-all program of the fascist brand of socialism and the communist brand. Fascists (thinking that capitalists of one nation would not lift a finger to help fellow capitalists in other nations) believed that socialist nations could exist safely in a world where other nations retained capitalistic systems. Hence, fascists did not feel the absolute compulsion, that communists felt, for world conquest. Fascists were devoted to what Hitler called *national socialism* (*nazi* being a new-deal type abbreviation meaning national socialism). Communists are devoted to *international socialism*.

Totalitarian liberals in the United States, having the same ultimate goal as socialists, fascists, and communists, have used methods adapted from all three groups.

For the most part, American liberals have presented their socialist programs under false labels palatable to the people. In some instances, however, liberals have used the old direct socialist approach: brainwashing a majority of the Congress and a substantial portion of the public into accepting (in utter defiance of constitutional limitations) experiments in pure socialism: government ownership and operation of electric power facilities, for example.

American liberals share with fascists a contempt for capitalism; but their manipulation of capitalists has not been so cynically obvious, or so complete, as that of fascists. A system closely similar to

the corporate states of fascist Italy and nazi Germany has been erected in the United States. Today there are hundreds of huge federal corporations which compete with private corporations.

In the United States, private corporations have not yet lost all control over their own operations, as they eventually did in Germany and Italy. During Mussolini's and Hitler's rise to power, big corporations in Italy and Germany enjoyed a honeymoon period. By cooperating with government, they got profitable business from government. In the United States, big corporations are still in that honeymoon period. They support extravagant spending programs of the federal government, because the spending provides lush contracts. Many big corporations, which do not profit directly from government contracts, profit indirectly from the economic stimulation of government lending, spending, and giveaways in their communities. Cooperating with big government also provides some insurance against harassment by the Internal Revenue Service, and other federal agencies. Many American businessmen (who neither profit from nor approve the government programs they tolerate) go along to get along. It was the same in fascist Italy and in nazi Germany.

In some instances, American political liberals use the communist technique of doing what they please, in defiance not only of the Constitution, but of Congress, and without waiting to brainwash the public—hoping to make it all “legal” and acceptable later on. President John F. Kennedy did a great deal of this—instituting, by Executive Order, programs which Congress had not authorized, financing the illegal programs with money appropriated for other purposes, until Congress could be manipulated into “authorizing” what had already been done. President Johnson uses this same tactic, though Johnson does not have as much need for it as Kennedy had. Johnson is far more successful than Kennedy, in getting prior congressional “authorization” for his programs.

Socialists (calling themselves liberals or new dealers) acquired major political power in the United States during the first 100 days of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration in 1933.

As late as 1948, however, socialists still had a distinct party and were still running their own candidates in national elections. They were not yet totally satisfied with liberal progress toward the socialist state.

In 1952, Norman Thomas, head of the socialist party, said there was no longer any need for him to run for the presidency, because the major parties had stolen his platform.

In November, 1963, Norman Thomas said that about 80% of the socialist party's platform had been enacted into law in the United States. In 1964, Thomas made a speaking tour, campaigning for Lyndon B. Johnson.⁽⁴⁾

The success of America's totalitarian liberals, in directing the socialist revolution in the United States, has not only put American socialists out of business as a distinct political group, but has also had profound influence on communist tactics throughout the world.

In 1957, communists—for the first time in history—gained control of government power, not by force of arms or by subversion, but by persuading a majority of voters to vote for known communist candidates. This happened in Kerala, a state in the southern part of India; in Java; in Okinawa; and in British Guiana. Commenting on these political phenomena of 1957, *U. S. News & World Report* (September 6, 1957) said:

“The Reds, who for years avoided free elections in favor of subversion and armed aggression, are turning to American-style political campaigning The Communists in Kerala ran openly on a Communist Party ticket, but they made no references to Marxism, Moscow, and revolution of the working class. Instead, they promised something for almost everyone. Jobs were promised to workers in an area where unemployment is large and growing Tax relief and land of their own were promised to the peasants More and better schooling . . . was pledged by the Communists to disgruntled students.”

In the United States, communists have adopted, *in toto*, the techniques of our totalitarian liberals. Communists no longer openly advocate communism in the United States: they advocate the programs of liberalism, and use liberal labels for them

—knowing that completion of liberal programs means completion of the socialist revolution. The United States will then be ready for integration into a worldwide union of socialist states—the ultimate goal of communism.

In the 1960 presidential election year, the communist party of the United States (23 West 26th Street, New York 10, New York) distributed nationally a four-page statement of the party's political objectives for that year. The statement advocated the same major programs that were supported in the platforms of Democrat and Republican parties of 1960: increased foreign aid to underdeveloped nations; strengthening the United Nations as the keystone of American foreign policy; increased social security benefits for the aged; federally-enforced racial integration in all areas of American life, public and private; a new and bigger farm subsidy program; increased giveaway of American agricultural goods abroad; federal aid to economically distressed areas in the United States; enlarged federal programs of slum clearance, urban renewal, public housing.

In the 1964 presidential election year, the communist party vigorously supported Lyndon B. Johnson. Communist officials had words of praise for liberal Republicans, but said "most of the broad peoples' movements are in the orbit of the Democratic Party."⁽⁵⁾

In the *American Opinion* article quoted at the outset of this *Report*, Martin Dies discusses the im-

plementation, in the United States, of Points One, Two, Three, Five, Six, Seven, and Eight of the Communist Manifesto's ten-point platform for communist conquest.

In subsequent *Reports*, I will discuss implementation of Point Nine of the *Communist Manifesto*, give more details on the implementation of Point One, reveal how communists dominate the politics of one State in the American union, and mention some of the organizations created to promote the socialist revolution in our nation.

FOOTNOTES

- (1) "How We Are Being Communized," by Martin Dies, *American Opinion*, July-August, 1965, pp. 113-25; subscription: \$10.00 a year, address 395 Concord Ave., Belmont, Massachusetts 02178
- (2) For additional details on the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities during its first 7 years, and the vilification of anti-communists, see the excellent book, *Martin Dies' Story* by Martin Dies, The Bookmailer, 1963, 30 West Price Street, Linden, New Jersey, 07036, price: \$5.00.
- (3) "The Radical Right in America Today," memo by Victor G. and Walter P. Reuther to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, *The Christian Beacon*, August, 15, 1963, pp. 4-5
- (4) "People," *The Dallas Morning News*, November 21, 1963, Section 1, p. 3; "Many Socialists Backing Johnson," by Peter Kihss, *The New York Times*, October 11, 1964, p. 73
- (5) "United People's Action For Peace, Democracy and Social Progress," by Gus Hall, special feature edition of *The Worker*, June 23, 1963

WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Born in Missouri, reared in Texas, Dan Smoot went to SMU getting BA and MA degrees, 1938 and 1940. In 1941, he joined the faculty at Harvard as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work for a doctorate in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent: three and a half years on communist investigations; two years on FBI headquarters staff; almost four years on general FBI cases in various places. He resigned from the FBI and, from 1951 to 1955, was commentator on national radio and television programs, giving *both* sides of controversial issues. In July, 1955, he started his present profit-supported, free-enterprise business: publishing *The Dan Smoot Report*, a weekly magazine available by subscription; and producing a weekly news-analysis radio and television broadcast, available for sponsorship by reputable business firms, as an advertising vehicle. The *Report* and broadcast give *one* side of important issues: the side that presents documented truth using the American Constitution as a yardstick. If you think Smoot's materials are effective against socialism and communism, you can help immensely—help get subscribers for the *Report*, commercial sponsors for the broadcast.


BOUND VOLUMES OF THE DAN SMOOT REPORT

The Dan Smoot Report is exhaustively researched, carefully written, and thoroughly documented. Thus, the material in our Bound Volumes is invaluable to those interested in American history and constitutional government, and in the great controversies troubling the world today.

Each Volume contains all weekly *Reports* for a calendar year, a table of contents, and extensive index. They are handsome books, more than 400 pages, bound in maroon fabrikoid with gold lettering.


EACH BOUND VOLUME IS A TREASURE HOUSE OF INFORMATION FOR — \$10.00*

(Volumes for the years 1955 through 1961 are sold out)




VOLUME X — 1964: \$10.00*

Revealing studies in depth on such subjects as — NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES . . . PANAMA CANAL . . . IMMIGRATION LAWS . . . MEDICARE . . . COMMUNIST SPIES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT . . . WAR ON POVERTY . . . VIETNAM . . . GENERAL MACARTHUR . . . COMMUNISM IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT . . . THE INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT



VOLUME IX — 1963: \$10.00*

A chronological account and analysis of a historic year — THE ASSASSINATION . . . URBAN RENEWAL . . . ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS . . . LAWLESS GOVERNMENT . . . CHINA . . . LAOS . . . HOW FOREIGN AID IS KILLING AMERICA . . . WORLD COURT . . . DISARMAMENT . . . TRAGEDY OF U. S. MEMBERSHIP IN THE UN



VOLUME VIII — 1962: \$10.00*

Contemporary analyses of memorable events, against the backdrop of history — SUPREME COURT'S PRAYER DECISIONS . . . THE MISSISSIPPI TRAGEDY . . . BERLIN . . . CUBA . . . CONGO INTRIGUE . . . PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION . . . EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET . . . UN AND WORLD GOVERNMENT . . . THE WAGES OF SOCIALISM . . . THE WELFARE RACKET

ORDER FORM BELOW

YOUR NAME: _____

STREET: _____

CITY AND STATE: _____

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT

P. O. BOX 9538

DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

_____ COPIES BOUND VOLUME X (1964) — \$10.00 each*

_____ COPIES BOUND VOLUME IX (1963) — \$10.00 each*

_____ COPIES BOUND VOLUME VIII (1962) — \$10.00 each*

\$_____ Payment Enclosed

*(\$10.20 each for orders in Texas for Texas Delivery)